



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,813	06/21/2000	Adriana Ardeleanu	MSI-583US	7153
22801	7590	08/10/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/599,813

Applicant(s)

ARDELEANU ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/21/04, 04/13/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in responses to RCE filed 05/02/2005. Claims 1-45 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 20, 27, 35, and 39 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/02/2005 has been entered.

Oath/Declaration

3. Receipt is acknowledged of petition to expunge the previously filed Rule 131 Declaration on 04/11/2005.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Natan et al. US Pub No. 2003/0158897 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed 05/09/2000 (hereinafter Ben-Natan), in view of Moore et al. US Pub No. 2001/0056429 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/191,662 filed 03/23/2000 (hereinafter Moore).

In regard to independent claim 1, rendering a DHTML document from an XML document (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022], disclosed a method of producing compatibility between different forms where a first form is preferably programmed in any hierarchical format, including forms composed of tagged fields. The method comprises the steps of: (a) setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML), and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML).

Ben-Natan does not explicitly teach, **using at least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML document**, however (as taught by Moore at page 18, paragraph [0291], disclosed many alternatives to HTML as a presentation language are possible, including DHTML (Dynamic HTML), XHTML (Extensible HTML), RDF, PDF, etc. Moreover, many alternatives to XSLT as a presentation mechanism are possible. In general, the presentation mechanism should be able to map a representation of a collection or a data object (e.g., an

XML DTD) into a presentation language such as HTML, and XSLT, as a scripting language, is a good choice).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Moore into Ben-Natan to provide a way, wherein using at least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML document. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user, at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations (as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008])

In regard to dependent claim 2, automatically presenting the user interfaces (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 10, paragraph [0128] (i.e. provide full automation of the process).

In regard to dependent claim 3, the user interface comprises a context block (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 10, paragraph [0128], as illustrated in FIGS. 7 and 8 between them depict a simple example using the convention in which the user information is stored in XML. The process starts by building a registration form. The form may look like FIG. 7 and the HTML of the form may look like FIG. 8).

In regard to dependent claim 4, the user interface comprises an in-document user interface (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 8, paragraph [0102], disclosed (XML structure) as input).

In regard to dependent claim 5, the user interface comprises an accelerator (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 2, paragraph [0016], disclosed the host is configured to rematch the attributes of users to attributes of communities automatically whenever there is an occurrence of any one of a group of conditions comprising a change in at least one attribute of at least one community, an update of at least one value of an attribute of at least one community, a change in at least one attribute of a user, an update of at least one value of an attribute of a user or any combination thereof).

In regard to dependent claim 6, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 3-5 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 7, the presenting deciding which user interface to present from a number of user interfaces (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 2, paragraph [0013], provided a system for defining communities and matching users into those communities, the matched users thereby gaining access to one or more elements associated with the communities and matching the attributes of at least one user to attributes of at least one community. Assigning the user to the community is based on results of matching. Through this process, the user preferably gains access to at least one element associated with community)

In regard to dependent claim 8, ascertaining, a user's actions within a document; and presenting a user interface based on the ascertained user's actions (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 2, paragraph [0013], According to one aspect of the present invention there is provided a system for defining communities and matching users into those communities, the matched users thereby gaining access to one or more elements associated with the communities. the system comprises a host that is connected to a network that serves for

communication with a plurality of users, the host is configured for: (a) creating a community or a plurality thereof by defining attributes for each of the communities, (b) defining one or more elements associated with each of the communities, (c) assigning attributes to a user. The attributes are extracted from information received from input from any combination of the user itself, a remote database, a local database, a local system, a remote system, a web site, a custom-built algorithm and (d) matching the attributes of at least one user to attributes of at least one community. Assigning the user to the community is based on results of matching. Through this process, the user preferably gains access to at least one element associated with said community).

In regard to dependent claim 9, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

5. **Claims 10-31, 33-35, and 37- 45** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Natan et al. US Pub No. 2003/0158897 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed 05/09/2000 (hereinafter Ben-Natan), in view of Moore et al. US Pub No. 2001/0056429 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/191,662 filed 03/23/2000 (hereinafter Moore), further in view of Krebs et al. US Patent No. 6,668,369 B1- filed 12/29/1999 (hereinafter Krebs).

In regard to independent claim 10, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

The combination of Ben-Natan and Moore do not explicitly teach, **rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view**, however (as taught by

Krebs at col. 2, line 55 through col. 3, line 2, provided a debugging tool for viewing dynamic code and assisting a programmer in locating errors in DHTML and scripts for generating dynamic code, also the present invention permits the programmer to view the dynamic code generated at the client by the script. This assists the programmer to locate errors in, or "debug", software by viewing the results of a script, rather than the script itself. Advantageously, the present invention may be used in conjunction with existing browser software by providing a viewer for viewing).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Krebs into Ben-Natan and Moore to provide a way, wherein rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

In regard to independent claim 39, using the one or more behaviors to map user interactions to the XML document and effect structural changes on the XML document (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022], disclosed a method of producing compatibility between different forms where a first form is preferably programmed in any hierarchical format, including forms composed of tagged fields. The method comprises the

steps of: (a) setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML), and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML);

Associating one or more behaviors with a DHTML tag in a DHTML view that has been rendered from an XML document; and responsive to a user interacting with a DHTML view associated with the DHTML tag, however (as taught by Krebs at col. 3, lines 35-50 (i.e. provided DHTML, also provided the table display tags (<TD>, </TD>) and related text of the script. It is easier to detect this error by viewing the dynamic code B shown in FIG. 3 than it is to detect this error by viewing the script A for generating the dynamic code shown in FIG. 2).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Krebs into Ben-Natan and Moore to provide a way, wherein associating one or more behaviors with a DHTML tag in a DHTML view that has been rendered from an XML document; and responsive to a user interacting with a DHTML view associated with the DHTML tag. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most

limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, (as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

In regard to dependent claim 40, wherein the one or more behaviors are data shape-dependent (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022] (i.e. setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form).

In regard to dependent claim 41, wherein the one or more behaviors are data shape-dependent, the data shape being defined by the XML document (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022] (i.e. provided the first form, wherein may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML)).

In regard to dependent claim 42, wherein the one or more behaviors are independent of any XML schema (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022], provided a tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML)).

In regard to dependent claim 43, wherein the one or more behaviors are independent of data values (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0016], provided at least one value of an attribute of a user).

In regard to dependent claim 44, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 42-43 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 45, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 1, 40, 42, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 11, wherein one parameter comprises a user location within a particular document (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 4, paragraph [0049], Identifying users in terms of their defining attributes and using these defining attributes to categorize them into the community groups to which they belong).

In regard to dependent claim 12, wherein one parameter comprises a portion of an XML schema that corresponds to a user's selection (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 2, paragraph [0022], disclosed a method of producing compatibility between different forms where a first form is preferably programmed in any hierarchical format, including forms composed of tagged fields. The method comprises the steps of: (a) setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML), and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML).

In regard to dependent claim 13, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 14, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 7-8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 16, and 18, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 4 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 17, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 5 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 19, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 10, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 20, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10-15 above, and is similarly rejected along the same Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 21, wherein the making of the selection comprises a cursor to a particular area within a document (as taught by Krebs at page 4, paragraph [0049], provided users a view of the dynamic code using software in accordance with the present invention. For example, the software could be incorporated into a Web browser and the dynamic code may be viewed by selecting an appropriate menu command, or by using a hot key or key sequence, e.g., depressing the shift key while double-clicking a mouse button).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Krebs into Ben-Natan and Moore to provide a way, wherein the making of the selection comprises a cursor to a particular area within a document. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

In regard to dependent claim 22, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 6 above, and is similarly rejected along the same Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 23, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 7 above, and is similarly rejected along the same Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 24, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 8 above, and is similarly rejected along the same Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 25, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 2 above, and is similarly rejected along the same

Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 26, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 20, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 27, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10, and 39 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

mapping, via one or more behavior, XML document (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 7, paragraph [0090], represented user information as XML (as described and exemplified earlier) then an XSL document may be used, using XPATH elements in order to define where the information the system is interested in resides. By using XSL the system can also apply simple computational elements on combinations of such values; for example, given the XML user information shown in FIG. 5A).

In regard to dependent claim 28, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 40 above, and is similarly rejected along the same

Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 29, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 41 above, and is similarly rejected along the same

Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 30, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 42 above, and is similarly rejected along the same

Rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 31, configured to function independently of XML tags that might be used (as taught by Ben-Natan at page 2, paragraph [0022], disclosed first form, wherein The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML), preferably programmed is in any hierarchical format and including forms composed of tagged fields, tagging node data with labels of a node if the node exists).

In regard to dependent claim 33, wherein the crystals are reusable across different XML documents (as taught by Moore at page 14, paragraph [0240], provided the one or more transformations, wherein included in the archive can be any of the transformations t.sub.1, t.sub.3, t.sub.4, t.sub.5 and so on).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Moore into Ben-Natan and Krebs to provide a way, wherein the crystals are reusable across different XML documents. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

In regard to dependent claim 34, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 27, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 35, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 10, 20, 27, 39, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 37, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 40, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 38, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 42, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

6. **Claims 32, and 36** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Natan et al. US Pub No. 2003/0158897 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed 05/09/2000 (hereinafter Ben-Natan), in view of Moore et al. US Pub No. 2001/0056429 A1 - provisional Application No. 60/191,662 filed 03/23/2000 (hereinafter Moore), further in view of Krebs et al. US Patent No. 6,668,369 B1- filed 12/29/1999 (hereinafter Krebs), and in further view of Kutay et al. US Pub No. 2002/0026461 A1 issued 02/28/2002 filed 06/05/2001 provisional Application No. 60/209,713 filed 06/05/2000 (hereinafter Kutay).

In regard to dependent claim 32, Ben-Natan, Moore, and Krebs do not explicitly teach, **behavior are implemented as binary code**, however, (as taught by Kutay at page 4, paragraph [0067], disclosed condition components, wherein representation in binary decision processing).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Kutay into Ben-Natan, Moore and Krebs to provide a way, wherein behavior are implemented as binary code. One of the ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

In regard to dependent claim 36, is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claim 32, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Argument

7. Applicant's Remark filed 05/02/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason for rejection is set forth in the rejection state above and further more of the following:

Reponses to argument claims 1-9, Remarks pages 11-13:

Applicant argues that, a continuation-in-part of U.S. Provisional No. 60/203,081 filed November 30, 2000 (after the June 21, 2000 filing date of the present application). Its corresponding provisional Application was filed on May 9, 2000, a little more than a month before the present application. By virtue of Ben-Natan's regular application being a continuation-in-part The Office respectfully disagrees; the prior art of Ben-Natan is not a continuation-in-part, see Ben-Natan first page. Therefor the filing date of the Ben-Natan is benefited form its Provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed November 30, 2000 is a valid date.

Further more Applicants argues that, the first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML) and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML. In fact, nowhere in the provisional application can Applicant find the acronyms "DHTML" or "XHTML". The Office respectfully disagrees; as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022], disclosed a method of producing compatibility between different forms where a first form is preferably programmed in any hierarchical format, including forms composed of tagged fields. The method comprises the steps of: (a) setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible markup language (XML), and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML). Also see MPEP 601- Content of Provisional and Nonprovisional Application for more detail. For further support, the Office would like to point out to the Applicant that as described by Provisional Application No. 60/203,081, in the Specification page 14-24 for detail of the prior art invention and Figures, see Fig on pages 15, 17, 19, 22 and 23. Therefor as such, the Office has establish prima-facie case of obviousness of modify teachings of Moore into Ben-Natan to provide a way, wherein using at least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML document, for more detail see the previous rejection and its motivation, which set forth in the rejection above.

Therefor independent claim 1 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 2-9 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 10-19, Remarks pages 13-14:

Applicant argues that, the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for at least two different reasons. First if the Office is using the same rationale as used in claim 1 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it prior art. The Office respectfully disagrees, first the filing date of the Ben-Natan is benefited form its Provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed November 30, 2000 is a valid date, see the response to Applicant's argument above for more detail.

Applicant argues that, Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 10 is not "substantially similar subject matter" as recited in claim 1. The Office respectfully disagrees, In regard to independent claim 10, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale. The combination of Ben-Natan and Moore do not explicitly teach, rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view, however as taught by Krebs at col. 2, line 55 through col. 3, line 2, provide a debugging tool for viewing dynamic code and for assisting a programmer in locating errors in DHTML and scripts for generating dynamic code, also the present invention permits the programmer to view the dynamic code generated at the client by the script. This assists the programmer to locate errors in, or "debug", software by viewing the results of a script, rather than the script itself. Advantageously, the

present invention may be used in conjunction with existing browser software by providing a viewer for viewing). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify teachings of Krebs into Ben-Natan and Moore to provide a way, wherein rendering a user interface sufficient to enable a user to interact with a DHTML view. One of the ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination for enabling the user at an indefinite point in time in the future to manipulate data/document infrastructure independently and not limit to any state or quality of being independent of a particular storage or computing platform or implementation or at most limited to only a generic class of storage or computing platforms or implementations, as taught by Moore at page 1, paragraph [0006] through [0008]. Since the code is now viewable, it would be more efficient and easier for programmer to debug the DHTML code, as taught by Krebs at col. 2, lines 40-50).

Therefor independent claim 10 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 11-19 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 20-26, Remarks pages 15-16:

Applicant argues that, the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for at least two different reasons. First if the Office is using the same rationale as used in claim 10 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it prior art. The Office respectfully disagrees, first the filing date of the Ben-Natan is benefited form its Provisional Application No. 60/203,081

filed November 30, 2000 is a valid date, see the response to Applicant's argument above for more detail.

Applicant argues that, Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 20 is not "substantially similar subject matter" as recited in claim 10-15. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection. For more evident the following clearly pointing out the similarity in the claim language between claim 20 and claims 10-15;

"Determining, based upon the selection, a corresponding selection in an XML document", incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 11 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

"Determining, based upon the corresponding selection in the XML document a corresponding portion of an XML schema", incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 12 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

"Determining, based upon the XML schema portion, one or more types of action that can be undertaken", incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 13 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

"Producing one or more operations that can be undertaken for various determined action types", incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 14 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

"And determining, from an XSL-T file that rendered the DHTML view, a user interface type that can be displayed for a user and used to implement the one or more operations", incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10 and 15 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Therefor independent claim 20 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 21-26 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 27-34, Remarks pages 16-17:

Applicant argues that, the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for at least two different reasons. First if the Office is using the same rationale as used in claim 10 as such pertains to Ben-Natan, then the subject matter on which the Office relies does not appear to have an effective date that renders it prior art. The Office respectfully disagrees, first the filing date of the Ben-Natan is benefited from its Provisional Application No. 60/203,081 filed November 30, 2000 is a valid date, see the response to Applicant's argument above for more detail.

Applicant argues that, Second, and equally important, the subject matter of claim 27 is not "substantially similar subject matter" as recited in claim 10-15. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason is set forth in the previous rejection.

Therefor independent claim 27 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 28-34 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 35-38, Remarks pages 17-18:

Applicant argues that; claim 35 is an independent claim that merits an independent examination. Nevertheless, for the reasons mentioned above, the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obvious and, for at least those reason, this claim is allowable. The Office respectfully disagrees, the Office has completed a through study of claim 35, but is directed to a

computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 10, 20, 27, 39, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale. Further more for the reasons mentioned above, the Office has established a prima facie case of obvious, the reason is set forth in the response above.

Therefor independent claim 35 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 36-38 remain rejected.

Reponses to argument claims 39-45, Remarks pages 19-20:

Applicant argues that, Ben-Natan teaches using one or more behaviors to map user interactions to the XML document and effect structural changes on the XML document, citing to page 1, paragraph [0022]. As noted above, the subject matter cited to by the Office appeared to be missing from Ben-Natan's provisional application; hence, its effective date is after the present application was filed. Accordingly, the material cited to by the Office does not appear to constitute prior art. As such, the Office has not established a prima facie case of obviousness and this claim is allowable. The Office has completed a through study of claim 39, The Office respectfully disagrees; as taught by Ben-Natan at page 1 paragraph [0022], disclosed a method of producing compatibility between different forms where a first form is preferably programmed in any hierarchical format, including forms composed of tagged fields. The method comprises the steps of: (a) setting up a hierarchy of labels as nodes on a tree such that each node is specifiable by a descending order of labels, (b) tagging node data with labels of a node if an appropriate node exists, and (c) adding a new node to the tree if an appropriate node does not exist, and (d) tagging field data in the second form with a concatenation of labels that match the traversal on the tree compatible with the first form. The first form may be an instance of the extensible

markup language (XML), and the second form in HTML or any extension of it such as DHTML or XHTML). Also see MPEP 601- Content of Provisional and Nonprovisional Application for more detail. For further support, the Office would like to point out to the Applicant that as described by Provisional Application No. 60/203,081, in the Specification page 14-24 for detail of the prior art invention and Figures, see Fig on pages 15, 17, 19, 22 and 23. Therefor as such, the Office has establish prima-facie case of obviousness of modify teachings of Moore into Ben-Natan to provide a way, wherein using at least one XSLT transformation (XSL-T); and presenting a user interface based, at least in part, on the XSL-T that was used to render the DHTML document, for more detail see the previous rejection and its motivation, which set forth in the rejection above.

Therefor independent claim 39 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims. Therefor the dependent claims 40-44 remain rejected.

Applicant argues that; claim 45 is an independent claim that merits an independent examination. Nevertheless, for the reasons mentioned above, the Office has failed to establish a prima facie case of obvious and, for at least those reason, this claim is allowable. The Office respectfully disagrees, the Office has completed a through study of claim 45, but is directed to a computer-readable media for performing the method of claims 1, 40, 42, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Further more for the reasons mentioned above, the Office has established a prima facie case of obvious, the reason is set forth in the response above.

Therefor independent claim 45 remains rejected.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2176
June 6, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/10/2005